America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 80 WWW.CODOH.COM May 2001

NOTEBOOK

Bradley R. Smith

David Irving is to speak at the Oxford Union on 15 May. Irving will contest the motion that "this house would restrict the free speech of extremists." He will debate the motion with Richard Rampton, QC, who defended the American scholar Deborah Lipstadt during the recent trial in London after she accused him of falsifying history.

The decision to invite Irving to speak was criticized by the Anti-Nazi League and the Board of Deputies of British Jews. The Union has invited four guests in all to take part in the debate. John Sentamu, the Bishop of Stepney, will speak for the motion and Rohan Jayasekera, director of the Index on Censorship, will speak against it.

An invitation to Irving to appear in the debating chamber Reform Club, was cancelled after protests. His topic was to

Continued on Page 7

What are the Facts of the Holocaust Story?

Do Zionist Ambitions and Inhumane Israeli State Policies Belong in the Discussion?

Below are excerpts from one exchange in David Thomas's Revisionist Discussion Forum on CODOHWeb. Discussions in this Forum alone are being accessed thousands of times in any 24-hour period. Those who access the Forums but do not post in them – they are the great majority -- are called "lurkers." They are our readers. Internet lurkers are exactly like those of us who read newspapers and listen to the news on television every day but do not write "letters to the editor." We are the "lurkers" mainline media, using it to inform our views of life and the world. The CODOH Discussion Groups are for those who want to learn what revisionist theory is all about without necessarily posting (writing) to the Forum. Like many of us who do not reveal our identity as revisionists lightly, CODOHWeb readers will sign their communications with pen names. All the following exchanges, and these are typical, took place the last week in April 2001. --BRS

Richard Murphy. As a new poster, and amateur historian of the Wehrmacht but not the whole span of the Third Reich

Continued on page 3

LETTERS

I look forward to your observations regarding Smith's Report *and the issues it addresses. I read everything you write. Oftentimes it influences how I handle the work. Unfortunately, I can not reply to correspondence. I just don't have enough hours in the day. I have space to print a very small number of your letters. If you do not want your name published in* **SR**,

---

Following is a letter written to a third party rather than to ***Smith's Report****. I seldom print such letters. The author of this letter is a reader of* ***SR*** *and has done work for CODOHWeb as well. Like most of us, he must use a pen name. In this case he has chosen to sign his John Doe as "Septic Skeptic," which you will find more amusing than it appears at first glance.*

Amazon.com is one of two or three of the largest retail booksellers in the world. It sells only via the Internet. It quotes from reviews by professionals on titles it features. Amazon has been featuring Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It? *by Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman. Amazon's Editorial Reviews are uniformly adulatory. Shermer is the publisher of Skeptic magazine and is lecturing about revisionism all over the country.*

Booklist (American Library Association). "History professor Shermer and Holocaust scholar Grobman analyze the attitudes and arguments of Holocaust deniers, who assert that there were "no gas chambers, no six million murdered, no master plan." [They] profile the most influential of the deniers, including Mark Weber, director of the anti-Semitic Institute for Historical Review, and David Irving …."

Library Journal. "... lays a framework for examining how we know that any historical event actually happened. Fascinating and thorough."

Yehuda Bauer. "Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman provide the necessary ammunition to confront one of the basest phenomena in today's academic world [… and …] to answer those who, usually motivated by pro-Nazi sympathies and antisemitism, deny or corrupt facts."

Publishers Weekly. "Holocaust denial gets an inventively thorough treatment in this important book."

The Los Angeles Times Book Review. "Shows. (…) how Holocaust deniers wrest sinister untruths from the documentary evidence…."

Robert Jan van Pelt. "An excellent and timely book …."

Franklin H. Littell. (President, The Philadelphia Center on the Holocaust, Genocide, and Human Rights) "Like cancer, HIV, and influenza, Holocaust denial is a drain on human resources, energy, and creativity."

But now we get a different perspective on the book. On 23 April our own Septic Skeptic, having read Shermer and Grobman's opus, submitted his own review of the book to Amazon.com, the review was accepted, and as of this writing (7 May) the review is still there for all the world to read.

The Septic Skeptic. **"**This book is about what I had expected, so I cannot say I found it disappointing. Its treatment of Holocaust revisionism is superficial at best and dishonest otherwise. Having read most of the revisionist works cited by Dr. Shermer I can honestly respond when he writes that: 'we hope our book has not only provided a thorough and thoughtful answer to all the claims of the Holocaust deniers, but also clearly presents the convergence of evidence of how we know the Holocaust (or anything in history) happened….' that [he has] not even come close.

"It is for good reason the subtitle of the book is: 'Who says the Holocaust never happened and why do they say it?" and not "what they say and why are they mistaken.' Dr. Shermer spends most of the book attacking men and motives rather than answering the arguments or claims of revisionists. If people want to know what revisionists really claim, they can read some of their books for themselves [or go to] Websites like vho.org, ihr.org, codoh.org and russgranata.com. Read some of the essays there.

"As for Dr. Shermer's 'convergence of evidence,' I learned this concept under a different name in religion class. There it was called 'leap of faith.' Early in the book the authors state that revisionists prey on people's ignorance. It was my experience to find quite the opposite to be the case. The more I learned about the Holocaust the less I believed it. As I continued to read about it, disbelief grew into a knowledge of what actually happened and why major aspects of Holocaust story are false.

"This book is a failure. It doesn't even address most revisionist research much less answer all revisionist arguments or claims. As I was reading it, my wife kept asking me: 'What's so funny?'"

What we have here then is a revisionist reaction to a book uniformly praised by the professionals, on the most widely accessed bookseller's page on the Internet or anywhere else in the world. At the same time, the addresses of four major revisionist Websites are displayed – most likely to readers who have never before read anything about revisionist theory. This is likely one of the contributing factors to the increase of accesses to revisionist documents on CODOHWeb.

As an aside, I can not refrain from recalling, yet once again, that Dr. Franklin H. Littell is the religious egghead who has written of me that I am an expression of "the One who goes back and forth in the earth and up and down in it." I never fail to feel a little rush when I come across the good Doctor's name.

And then I note that Yehuda Bauer is careful to write very carefully that revisionists are "usually" motivated by pro-Nazi sympathies and antisemitism…." This is exactly where these professors, without yet realizing it, have put themselves in a box. What are they going to do with those of us who are not motivated by what they need us to be motivated by? One day they are going to have to deal with us.

That's the day when the game will be up.

How bad can it get? Reading your condition statement in the current newsletter (SR79) is very troubling. I'm certain there is a light at the end of the tunnel – and I don't mean the California Zephyr heading for you at full speed. I'll fire off a small stipend to your Visalia address today just in case it might keep you away from tall buildings, razor blades, and other similar instruments of self-destruction. See you later, and best wishes.

D.M., CA

I like funny guys, and then of course small stipends keep me out of all kinds of trouble. Thanks.

(though my chosen specialty invariably leads me into discussions of this type), I would like to ask you all what was to be gained (by anyone) by creating the story about the Holocaust if, as some assert, it did not happen?

Braveheart In a material sense, the Holocaust is used as an excuse to perpetuate the State of Israel. In a cultural/ethnic sense, the Holocaust is tremendously valuable to the Jewish community. It allows all Jews of all denominations to unite in the face of any possible threat of renewed anti-Semitism. In the June 22, 2000 edition of the *Newark Star-Ledger*, the results of a poll of Jews were published. They were asked, "There are many ways of being Jewish. How much, if at all, are the following factors important to your Jewishness?"

The factor, "Remembering the Holocaust", was the most important aspect of being Jewish according to 73% of the Jews polled. In other words, three out of four Jews believe that in order to best be Jewish, you have to remember the Holocaust. As for the factor "Believing in God", only 54% said that belief in God was very important to being Jewish. So there you have it - belief in the Holocaust is more important than belief in Yahweh for contemporary Jews.

Ralph Marquardt That attitude is simplistic and naive. Certainly NS Germany persecuted the Jewish people. Most Jews under Nazi control were taken from their homes, put in camps, robbed, and used for forced labor. The death rate was very high. In addition, perhaps hundreds of thousands were shot, either by NS Germans or by agents of NS German puppets. So—that's the Holocaust. There are basically three threads to the Holocaust revisionist debate.

The first is an impressionistic one. There are a lot of Germans and people who identify with Germany who can't handle the simple fact that during WW2 the Germans killed a lot of Jews. They try to minimize it, explain it away, excuse it. This may not be very nice, but common among super-patriot types. Consider the French and Algeria, Israel and Deir Yassin, the US and the Indian exterminations, or the US and slavery. It's always the same: "Well, it wasn't *that* bad." Or "Well, so and so did such and such, and they couldn't really help it." You can also find the same kind of excuse mongering about US strategic and nuclear bombing, Vietnam, and many other things as well.

That is the part of "Denial" that freaks everyone out but it's really just a point of view. It's confusing perhaps because of a belief that allegiance and devotion to a nation is incompatible with admitting that nation's sins. It's the same with individual relationships. It's hard for most people to say "Sorry" or to admit that they have done something wrong. Furthermore, when you get people—like Bill Clinton—who are addicted to apologizing you get a kind of queasy feeling. Frankly, as far as Germany goes, I think they need a little healthy patriotism and a lot less of this constant breast beating, which at 55 years remove is phony and self-indulgent.

The second thread of revisionism is the way the Holocaust is exploited to support Israel, provide Jewish identity, etc. Thanks to Peter Novick, Finkelstein and other Jews, that message has finally been mainstreamed. But revisionists—beginning with Paul Rassinier—have been saying it for over forty years. That thread has petered out for revisionists.

The third thread really comes down to whether or not the Germans systematically murdered three million Jews in a half dozen locations, each one not much bigger than your average Wal-Mart. That idea is absolutely idiotic once you start to think about it, but the problem is that in 1945 people were not in a particularly rational frame of mind. They believed it, and the communists in Eastern Europe cooked just enough evidence so everyone *could* believe it. The extermination camp/gas chamber idea is the weak link in the Holocaust story. That's why revisionists fastened on it originally. It was the main way to decrease the Holocaust's impact in demonizing Germany. Since then however revisionism has attracted a lot of people—like me—who just don't believe the extermination camp/gas chamber idea and don't believe it serves anyone's interests—least of all those of Jews—to put people in jail over it.

However, while a half hour of reasoning will convince the normal person that the extermination camp/gas chamber stories are phony, it has to be stressed that Jews do not tend to be rational about this subject, but highly emotional. That's why they allowed the revisionists to get their goat in the beginning, and why, judging by recent reactions, the revisionists still have that goat. It also doesn't help that many revisionists couple their historical critiques with gratuitous Israel bashing and complaints that the "Jews made it all up," both tactics likely to inspire paranoid reactions.

In short, the Holocaust wasn't "created", there was a "Holocaust" in the sense that the Jews of Europe were persecuted, robbed, locked up, put to work, shot, and died in large numbers (I have no idea how many and I don't think it matters). But the idea of extermination camps/gas chambers in which 3 million Jews according to plan systematically executed with pesticide or auto exhaust using the latest scientific techniques blah blah blah, is false. Still, in 1945 everyone believed it. The tragic error is that the IMT validated that popular belief. End of story.

If I read my tea leaves right, the giving up of the gas chamber/extermination camp fable will lead to a tremendous sigh of relief among both revisionists and Jews.

Dubhghall. Is it "gratuitous Israel bashing" to assert that the Zionist State benefits from world belief in the phony "Holocaust" so well described two posts up? Or that the policies of Israel resemble those of the German Nazis? Or that the Palestinians are the victims of a carefully thought-out ethnic cleansing? If not, can someone explain what it does mean and who does it here? Personally, I haven't noticed any Israel-bashing here that was "gratuitous," in the sense of being unsupported by fact.

Ralph Marquardt I mean gratuitous in the sense of uncalled-for. If someone wants to bash Israel, go ahead, but to bash Israel while at the same time arguing no gas chambers is going to lead any Jew within earshot to think that the one is being disputed in order to get at the other. More, since Israel and the Big H are big to most Jews, they are liable to think that the person so arguing simply has a thing about Jews.

That's why I say, make a choice. One or the other. I prefer getting the facts right about the Big H. than solving the problems of the Middle East. By the way, just assuming that all the Israelis pack up and move to—I dunno, Southern California? —who's going to take over Palestine? Someone who will allow easy access to Holy sites for Christians and Jews? Someone who will allow the US to test its fancy weapons systems and keep our military industrial complex humming? Someone who will not create a threat to Suez, or destabilize the Middle East generally? Just wondering.

Yes, Israel is screwed up. It is fighting a battle for the survival or the Jewish people – or so it thinks. They aren't going to give it up because I say so. They need reasonable alternatives.

Dubhghall What reasonable alternative do you offer to the embattled Israelis, under siege by those aggressive Palestinians? Let's see if I've got it.

Many Jews are very sensitive about any criticism of the Zionist State or "the Holocaust". They are upset if one does not view these subjects in the "accepted" fashion. Both of them. Very upset -- even hostile. Since the very purpose of this board is a critical discussion of "the Holocaust" (Norman Finkelstein definition here) and we don't want to drop that, this means that we should go a little easy on the Israeli criticism. In this sense, criticism of Israel linked to "the Holocaust" is to be specially understood here to be "gratuitous Israel bashing" or "snarling," even though all of us (or most of us) know that the canonical Holocaust is the main political and emotional rationale for the Zionist state of Israel (at least for the goyim -- for many Jews it has a religious basis).

OK, I think I've got it. If we are nicer to the Jews - in this case not mentioning the linkage of Zionism and "the Holocaust" - then Jews may see the reasonableness of our revisionism. It hasn't worked yet, but maybe it will in the future. Now who is going to tell them about our new offer?

Ralph Marquardt One can link the Holocaust and Zionism all one wants. Finkelstein does it all the time without disputing Holocaust facts. Disputing Holocaust facts is what revisionism tries to do. This is not a case of being reasonable, but of being persuasive. I have been involved in communicating about this topic for several years now. I can say that I have had exchanges with several Jews privately who are willing to accept—again, to me privately—that the gas chamber stories might be all screwed up but they are not willing to listen if someone couples that argument with anti-Jewish or anti-Israel invective.

This is not a question of doing an end around the publishing establishment. The Internet has solved that problem. It's a question of *persuading* the experts in the relevant fields that the H. story has false elements that need to be rectified. But neither a Jewish nor a non-Jewish professor of history, or professional egghead, or Op Ed columnist will *listen* if criticism of the Holocaust story is coupled with anti-Zionism or general anti-Jewish sentiments. That's just a fact. No one is stopping people (in the US) from reading revisionist history today. No one is preventing people from thinking what they please in the US. The censorship movement got a severe blow simultaneous with the Irving trial. So what's left? Persuading the people who write the influential books to change their minds about what happened during WW2. That can only be achieved by fact-based analyses where *any* rhetoric (pro-German, anti-Israel, anti-Jewish, pro-Arab) is kept to a minimum.

Or, if one is hung up on Israel's bad conduct, getting people to change their minds about accepting such conduct. For that, one doesn't have to bring up the H at all. It's fighting a war on two fronts for no good reason. One can do the first, or the second. But if one tries to do both at the same time, one will succeed at neither. Again, that's just a fact. The reason why revisionism has had only modest success over the years is that it has usually failed to separate the two types of criticism. (That and the fact that it has tended to be totally insensitive to Jewish feelings on the subject, which is counter-productive, because the H is a Jewish story, and it won't be revised until Jews feel like revising it.)

Some revisionists, as a result of being ignored, have tried to console themselves that the change in the paradigm when the gas chambers go under will cause a kind of Fourieresque transformation of reality. False. It has never worked that way in the past and it won't work that way now. Germany isn't going to get its old lands back either, unless they re-colonize them. That too is a fact. Try to understand the other guy's point of view.

"I hear you, but, sorry, I don't believe there were any gas chambers."

"Well, OK, but—how do you explain all this other anti-Israeli, anti-Jewish stuff?" In response to that question revisionists can usually do little better than to blame it on Jews which is a total non-starter. It's not complicated.

Hannover Try as one might to approach the 'holocaust' without damning the Jews, it will be useless in the long run because of the 'malice of forethought' that has been part & parcel to this fraud from day one, and has destroyed untold numbers of innocent lives. Jews know that as Revisionist views gain strength, they (Jews) come out stinking to high heaven regardless of how Revisionists present their views. Why? Because I believe that many, many Jews in leadership positions & otherwise, know full well that the story is a fraud as alleged, truth doesn't matter. It's often said ... "Once you lie, you must continue to lie in an attempt to cover the previous lies." Ultimately it falls apart, and that is what we are beginning to see now. Revisionists do not need the blessings of Jews, nor will we get it, regardless of approach.

Ralph Marquardt There's an old joke about an American who goes to Moscow and his host keeps bragging about how the subway system is always on time. So they go down there—way down, because East Euro subways are meant to double as bomb shelters—and they wait for the train. It is not on time. It's 10 minutes late. It's 20 minutes late. After about 40 minutes the American turns to his host, clears his throat and says, "Excuse me, but where's the train?" His host snarls, "I don't know where it is, but at least we didn't exterminate any Indians."

I guess what I'm trying to say is that it is either the subway train or the Indians. Put 'em together and it just doesn't work.

The most troubling, words for me in the above exchange are these by Ralph Marquardt. "... make a choice. One or the other. I prefer getting the facts right about the Big H. to solving the problems of the Middle East." Strictly speaking, revisionist theory does not address Zionism or the Middle East. Just the facts, gentlemen, about the extermination camp/gas chamber charges. At the same time, I agree that the H. story is and always was used to legitimate the invasion of Palestine by European Jews. I believe Marquardt would probably agree it is and always was.

The Middle East is where the suffering is (it's everywhere else too). Do I want to focus on getting the H. facts straight before helping to stop the suffering in Palestine and Israel? Are historical facts more important than those persons who live and suffer today? Depends who you think you are.

One afternoon last summer I had a late lunch with Ernst Zuendel. He spoke passionately about the anti-German cruelty of the H. story, how it debases German culture, which entails the suffering, the cruel debasement of the psychological and spiritual lives of all Germans. As Billy Carter might have said: "And there's a hell of a lot more Germans than there are Jews."

I agree with almost everything written by everyone in the above exchange. Tactics are not writ in concrete. The situation is always changing, tactics are always changing. Tactics have to do with what works. Sometimes we decide to go with what we feel is right, whether it's going to work or not. In the end, after all, not very much works. -- BRS

Beirut Conference on Revisionism and Zionism. The Leaders of the Arab States should Quit their Silence on the Imposture of the "Holocaust"

Robert Faurisson

(Following are "Five Introductory Remarks" to the paper by Professor Faurisson that was to delivered at the ill-fated Beirut revisionist conference on 31 March. The 7,000-word paper itself is too long to be re-printed here in its entirety, but the "Introductory Remarks" alone are so trenchant we thought you would like to have them.)

1 I do mean "the leaders", and not: "the intellectuals, the academics, the journalists" some of whom have already expressed themselves on the matter;

2 The word "Holocaust" (always to be placed in quotation marks) designates the triple myth of the alleged genocide of the Jews, the alleged Nazi gas chambers and the alleged number of six million Jewish victims of the Second World War. In the course of a history full of fury, blood and fire, humanity has known a hundred holocausts, that is, appalling losses of human life or bloody catastrophes (presented, at the origin of the word's use in this manner, as a sort of offering demanded by some superior forces); but our contemporaries have been conditioned to keep in mind only one holocaust, that of the Jews; it is written today with a capital letter, and has become unique: there is no longer the need to add "of the Jews". None of the other previous holocausts has given rise to any financial indemnity, reparation or compensation to match those which the Jews have claimed and obtained for a catastrophe or "Shoah" which they describe as unique and unprecedented, and which would, in effect, be so if its three components (genocide, Nazi gas chambers and six million victims) had been real. If many Euro-

pean Jews suffered and died during the war in question, without that suffering's amounting to what today's Jews mean by the term "Holocaust", many other peoples and communities, in particular the Germans, the Japanese, the Russians and the Chinese, suffered, in reality, a fate far worse than that of the Jews; let us but think of the phosphorous- or nuclear-fuelled firestorms in which at least a million Germans and Japanese met an atrocious death (and what of the wounded and mutilated?). It is, moreover, fitting to add that millions of European Jews survived this alleged policy of physical extermination to go on to enjoy, after the war, a power and a prosperity without precedent in their history. To privilege, as is thus done, the alleged "Holocaust" is to inflate Jewish suffering beyond all measure in both quality and quantity and to reduce, in direct proportion, the suffering of all others, none of whose ordeals receives even so much as a specific name;

3 Imposture is an imposed lie; here it is a question of a historical lie, meaning that, forged by liars or fabricators of outlandish tales, it has subsequently been adopted by an ever-expanding number of people who, in good faith or bad, have peddled it; in the event, we are thus dealing with a tiny number of liars and a plethora of peddlers;

4 The opposite of such a lie, fabricated or peddled, is the factual truth. Still, as the word "truth" is vague and overused, I prefer exactitude. Revisionism consists in trying to examine and correct what is generally accepted with a view to establishing with exactitude the nature of an object, the reality of a fact, the worth of a figure, the authenticity, the veracity and the import of a text or document;

5 Zionism is an ideology whilst revisionism is a method.

As a revisionist I shall be making a judgement less of Zionism itself (at the dawn of the 21st century) than on the use which it makes of the "Holocaust" imposture.

If the leaders of the Muslim states planned to quit their silence on this imposture and if, in so doing, they put a challenge to the Jewish and Zionist lobby, they would obviously need first a) to make a proper sizing up of the adversary, then b) to decide on an appropriate strategy and, finally, c) to determine the exact area on which to concentrate their attacks. To discuss these three points, I shall divide my talk into three parts.

In a first part, in order to avoid any mistakes as to the opponents' identity and to ensure that they are correctly sized up, I shall expound on what are, in my view, the seeming weak points of the Jews and Zionists, then on their true weak points. In a second part, concerning the strategy to adopt, I shall sum up certain conclusions that I reached, in November 2000, during my visit to Teheran, in the company of representatives of the Centre of Strategic Studies of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Finally, in a third part, I shall designate the precise target to hit: "the magic Nazi gas chamber" (as Louis-Ferdinand Celine put it).

(If you would like to have the full 7,000 word paper by Dr. Faurisson, please send along $10 or so and I'll send it along.)

NOTEBOOK continued from p.1

Libel with Freedom of Speech". But Jonathan Marshall of the university's Keble College, Joint-President of the Oxford Reform Club, informed Mr. Irving (4 October 2000) that:

> *" ... it is clear that we would need to implement special security measures to ensure the safety of all those who wanted to be present. According to University statues, such a cost would have to be borne by the Oxford Reform Club. As you will no doubt appreciate, we are not a rich society, and we simply could not afford to pay such costs."*

A few years ago when I planned to speak throughout Southern California, at campuses to which I could drive at a nominal cost in time and money, I was quickly stymied. I spoke at California State U-Long Beach where it went off without a hitch. Then I spoke at U Southern California and there were problems. Shooting threats, the lecture room being changed at the last moment, attendees having to submit to a search for weapons, the usual. After that I found that I was being asked to buy insurance to speak on campus. Property insurance and personal liability insurance. The costs were prohibitive for me at that time. My campus speaking career was finished.

Violence, or the threat of violence, are the only tools available to those who want to suppress intellectual freedom.

Germar Rudolf, on the day I sent **SR79** to the printers, distributed an email communication providing additional details regarding accesses to his Website <vho.org> and the downloading of materials. He appears to be rather surprised to find that some "50% of all vho.org downloads and some 35% of all file {originate with] the French Website aaargh.vho.org, not by vho.org itself.'

On <vho.org> (not "vho.com" as I had it in **SR79**) the section accessed most heavily is still the German, mainly Rudolf's own *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (*Dissecting the Holocaust*) and his *Journal*. In the French section <aaargh-international> Rassinier is the strongest draw, which is fitting, as Rassinier is the one who really started it all, followed by Faurisson and the News section. In the English section of Rudolf's site the *Journal of Historical Review* draws the most hits. Rudolf has set a goal for himself to post the contents of every issue of the JHR that has ever been published. Let's see what the censors do about this.

So it turns out that the French are accessing Germar's German Website almost as much as the Germans are. A

unique Franco/German alliance. Nothing wrong with that.

"Marketing Ashes" is the title of an article published in the Palestinian Authority daily *Al-Hayat Al-Jadida* (13 April). The title alone is worth the price of admission. Here are a few excerpts from the piece.

"The issue of the holocaust rises again. It defies disappearing over its half-century because Zionist propaganda has converted it into a means to produce political and economic benefit, besides exploiting it for the advancement of occupation and settlement...."

"By and large, the Zionist movement cannot tolerate inactivity in any facet of the holocaust profession, especially since intelligentsia from around the globe have begun addressing the corresponding holocaust, that is, the one the Hebrew State is bringing upon the Palestinians."

"The question now discussed in the halls of the universities and the renowned publishing houses in the world's capitols is: has this hen reached its expiration date, which lays golden eggs for the Jews everywhere?"

It's been five days since Paloma disappeared. The apartment is unbearably empty. Every morning I go out walking on Mooney Boulevard to be in the presence of others. Sometimes I try to stop thinking, to just walk. I try to only listen, or to only see, or to be only aware of the body moving itself along. I can stop the thinking for only one moment at a time, then it is there again going over and over the same stuff. In those rare moments when I am aware without thinking I see how insignificant this body is, how tiny this nice little city of 95,000, how I am a mere speck among the billions that walk the same planet this body wanders over.

Every evening after dark, when the apartment is unbearably empty, I go out walking to be in the presence of the others. Sometimes I try to see the lights of the storefronts and the red or white lights on the automobiles coming and going without thinking. Sometimes I try to only listen to the motors and the tires of the cars passing, the voices talking or laughing, the sounds the birds make. I didn't know the birds made night sounds right there on the boulevard. When I look up, the stars appear to be there just like they were when I was a boy, but I am told now that each is streaking out through one heaven after another, growing increasingly farther apart from the other. And I realize that while I fear for the safety of my daughter, my anguish is not for her but for myself, for my own awful loss, a kind of self-pity.

John Bennett is President of the Australian Civil Liberties Union, was a speaker at several IHR conferences, and is a personal friend from the 1980s. For going on three decades he has published a legal aid booklet for laymen titled *Your Rights*. I recently the 104-page, 27th edition for 2001. *Your Rights* is a consistently wide-ranging overview of citizen's legal rights under Australian law. In each edition of *YR* there is a section on Freedom of Speech and Censorship.

The 2001 edition includes reprints of two recent articles first published in the *Journal of Historical Review* by Mark Weber: "Australian Tribunal Orders Censorship of Adelaide Institute Web Site" and "Judge Gray's Harsh but Predictable Ruling: The Irving-Lipstadt Trial."

Two articles follow these by Bennett himself. "Holocaustomania?" deals with Australian media obsession with the usual H. stories. Bennett notes that Phillip Adams, Australia's leading atheist and skeptic, says it is "blasphemous" to query the extent of the Holocaust (sounds like our own Michael Shermer, publisher of *Skeptic* magazine). Bennett's second article, "The Holocaust Industry," outlines the furor over Professor Norman Finkelstein's book of that name. He quotes Abe Foxman of the ADL saying "I am a survivor and I find his (Finkelstein's) book a blasphemy...."

What is remarkable here is that *Your Rights* is routinely distributed to Australian Federal and State MPs, legal aid groups, libraries and the media. Even more remarkable is that *newsagents and booksellers in every State in Australia sell Your Rights.* I do not know of a single mainline civil rights organization ostensibly interested in intellectual freedom, in either the USA or Europe, which will publish and distribute anything suggesting that revisionist theory should not be suppressed.

The ACLU and John Bennett can be reached at Box 1137, Carlton 3053, Melbourne Australia.

One way to effectively censor revisionist theory on the Internet is for some hotshot "hacker" to gain secret entry to the site and start throwing monkey wrenches into its electronic gears. David Thomas, CODOH's Webmaster, tells us a little about of what may be the latest monkey wrench thrown into CODOHWeb. Why would anyone do this? The numbers tell the tale.

The CODOH Website has recently begun to experience an odd problem, not corrected yet because its cause is unknown. Many of the site's pages have a feature called a "page counter." This is a set of digits that look like a car's odometer, located at the bottom margin. They increment one count every time someone accesses the page on their computer screen.

A few weeks ago, most of our counters were set back to zero. Unlike a real car odometer, they don't roll over at 99,999; somehow the data stored on our service provider's computer got erased. It's either an odd computer glitch there, or someone has gained unauthorized access to the site (i.e. we've been "hacked"). The solution on the Home Page was to replace the automatic counter with a manual entry to be updated once a week. On the chance that it was hacked by someone who didn't want the world to know that our Home Page alone had 260,000 visits since May of 1998, we decided to up the ante. It now proudly displays the fact that the entire site has drawn 17,283, 831 hits in that two-

year period. That's what we call getting the word out!

The first week after Paloma disappeared my wife and I were on the phone day and night trying to decide what we should do this time. One night we were on the telephone – I wish I could remember exactly the moment the idea came to me – when I suggested that maybe we should relax a little, forget about institutionalizing our daughter, and make our house in Baja a refuge for her. Unconditionally. Alicia was not enthusiastic. She thought we should hunt her down like we had the other times.

The next night my wife called to tell me that Paloma had telephoned her. She had never done that before after disappearing. It was a great relief just to know for certain that she was alive. She wouldn't say where she was, but she was alive and sounded all right. I relaxed considerably. I finished **SR79** and got it to the printers, tightened up some loose ends in Visalia, then rented a Ryder's truck with a tow dolly for my '93 Hyundai, packed up the office, loaded the truck, and at 10pm Saturday night left for Mexico. I was too wired to think of staying the night to get some sleep. The tow dolly failed before I got out of Visalia. Took two hours for Ryder to get a man to fix it at the side of the road. At midnight I started off again. Drove south at a steady clip and was twenty miles south of Bakersfield when something went wrong with the truck's motor.

I drove it at five miles an hour on the side of the freeway to a truck stop and called Ryder again. Tried to sleep in the truck cab but couldn't. Too cold. At 5.30 in the morning I was told the truck was ready. Dawn was just breaking over the mountains. Dawn is an invigorating time for me. When I got over the mountain and down into San Fernando Valley I tried to get a room at a couple places but I was too early, the motels were still full from Saturday night revelers. I started taking naps in the truck cab. Drive, nap, drive and so on until I reached the Ryder yard in Chula Vista about noon.

My car was already packed with stuff that would go in storage. Took the car off the tow dolly and drove to my storage, unloaded, drove back to Ryder's, transferred my personal stuff from the truck to the car and then drove south across the border and down to the house in Baja. It was Sunday afternoon. Alicia had just returned from church. She hadn't expected me until Monday. We sat at the dining room table over lunch.

While we were still at table, Paloma walked in. She was dressed in a shirt, shorts for the beach, and her blond hair had green tints in it. She was smiling and gracious and very beautiful but when we started asking questions she closed up, then left. Two weeks have passed. We don't know where she sleeps, what she does. Gradually she has come to use the house as a refuge, stopping by most every day to eat or shower or just rest. She does not appear to be using.

Paloma's in love and sometimes stays with her boyfriend's family, though the boy's mother doesn't like it. The boy doesn't use and appears to have his feet on the ground. Paloma turned fifteen the end of March. I suspect that maybe she believes that the honorable thing to do is to give up everything for love. If I remember my Shakespeare right, Juliet was thirteen when she decided to do the same. I don't know. When I was their age I didn't have these problems. I had horses.

What does this have to do with Holocaust revisionism? Nothing whatever that I can think of.

Viernes is a local tabloid, one of a dozen lively papers published in this part of Baja. It bills itself as a paper of criticism, analysis and satire. Typically it runs sixteen pages, two in English. The stuff in English is strictly local color. On the bottom of each inside page there is a one-line black bar where noted writers are quoted in English in white type. Such fellows as Edgar Allen Poe, Norman Mailer, Henry Bergson, Emerson, D'Alembert, Jean de la Bruyere, Santiago Ramon y Cajal, Franz Kafka, Seneca, Balzac, William Claxton (who the devil is this?) and others.

Yesterday was Friday (*viernes*) so after my nightly walk I picked up a copy of *Viernes* and stopped at a taco bar near the house to have a glass of wine and go through the paper. You will be able to imagine the small surprise I felt when I saw that the lead quote in the 5 May issue of *Viernes* is by Joseph Goebbels: "We govern with love, not with the bayonet. (my translation from the Spanish from the *Viernes* translation from German, I suppose)." I was surprised that Goebbels was quoted at all, and I was surprised by the nature of the quote itself.

THANKS

For your support.

Bradley

As noted above, I am back in Baja. I have the same address I used for four years previous to my recent adventures in California. Mail sent to the Visalia address is already being forwarded to me here in Baja.

NEW (old!) ADDRESS

Smith's Report

is produced by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29
you will receive eleven issues of
Smith's Report
Canada and Mexico $35
Overseas $39

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, California 92143

Telephone (Baja): 011 52 661 23984

E-mail: brsmith@telnor.net

On the Internet: www.codoh.com